

Leptoquarks

Paul H. Frampton

Talk at Beyond the Standard Model V,
May 4, 1997. Balestrand, Norway

Abstract

In this review there is first a survey of the HERA data. Then we discuss the theory response including querying the consistency of the data, compositeness, contact terms, and leptoquarks including as a special case the R symmetry violating squark. The SU(15) possibility for a light leptoquark is mentioned. Finally there is a summary.

Contents

1. Data from HERA	3
2. Theory Response	3
2.1 Consistency of Data	3
2.2 Compositeness	3
2.3 Contact Interactions	4
2.4 Leptoquark [R Breaking Squark]	4
3. The SU(15) Possibility	4
4. Summary	5

1. Data from HERA

In the second half of February 1997, the two collaborations H1[1] and ZEUS[2] working on e^+p collisions at HERA: $e^+(27\text{GeV}) + p(820\text{GeV})$ simultaneously submitted to Z.Phys. announcements of small-statistics discrepancies from the Standard Model(SM). The two papers can also be downloaded from the World Wide Web at the URL: <http://info.desy.de/>

From the Web we may learn much interesting information. For example H1 has 400 members from 12 countries while ZEUS has 430 members from 12 countries.

As for physics, H1 finds 12 events with $Q^2 > 15,000\text{GeV}^2$ where the SM predicts 4.71 ± 0.76 . Coincidentally, ZEUS finds 2 events with $Q^2 > 35,000\text{GeV}^2$ for which the SM prediction is 0.145 ± 0.013 . The probability that these data result from a statistical fluctuation is 0.5%. This is the same as the probability that four dice thrown together will roll to a common number.

Another provocative fact, although not as clearcut when H1 and ZEUS are compared, is that these excess high- Q^2 events *may* cluster around a common x value. The mass $M = \sqrt{xs}$ of a direct-channel resonance would be $\sim 200\text{GeV}$ for H1 and perhaps somewhat higher for ZEUS.

There are 20 times more data in e^+p collisions compared to e^-p . For the latter there has been an ion trapping problem at HERA. The integrated luminosities are 34.3pb^{-1} of e^+p data and 1.53pb^{-1} of e^-p data.

The conservative reaction is that (i) we have been chasing deviations from the SM for two decades and experience has shown that more precise data always remove the discrepancy. (ii) instead of extrapolating the QCD to higher Q^2 we should make an overall fit including the new events. Actually (ii) seems unlikely to work because here we are dealing with valence quarks, not gluons, with structure functions that are better known - it is not like the situation for high transverse energy jets at FermiLab where the gluon structure functions could be modified to explain the data.

For the present purposes, we take the experimental result seriously at face value.

2. Theory Response

There have been 30 theory papers involving 63 theorists in the 10 weeks since the HERA announcement which for 14 events corresponds to over 2 papers and 4 theorists per event!

The 30 papers, with author(s) and hep-ph/97mmnnn numbers, are listed in chronological order of appearance in Refs.[3-32].

These 30 papers break down as follows:

- 1 on consistency of the data.[15]

- 2 on compositeness.[3, 32]
- 5 on contact interactions.[13, 18, 21, 22, 31]
- 9 on R-symmetry breaking squark. [4, 6, 7, 11, 19, 25, 26, 28, 29]
- 13 on light leptoquark. [5, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 23, 24, 27, 30]

We see that a new light ($\sim 200\text{GeV}$) particle is the most popular explanation with 22 papers out of the 30.

First, I shall review these 30 papers written by theorists in 1997.

Then I will review my own 1992 paper [33] predicting weak-scale leptoquarks.

2.1 Consistency of Data

This is from Drees, hep-ph/9703332. He compares H1 with ZEUS. First look at the distribution of $M(LQ) = \sqrt{xs}$. One finds $200.3 \pm 1.2\text{ GeV}$ (7 events) for H1 and $219.3 \pm 5.5\text{ GeV}$ (4 events) for ZEUS. These disagree by 3.4σ but overall uncertainty in the energy reduces this to 1.8σ , or an 8% chance occurrence.

Next compare the absolute event numbers 7 for H1 and 4 for ZEUS. The integrated luminosities are 14.2pb^{-1} for H1 and 20.1pb^{-1} for ZEUS. Zeus has "looser" cuts and the likelihood of this outcome is not higher than 5%.

Combining the two effects (x and # events) gives a 0.5% compatibility between H1 and ZEUS. This is about the same as the compatibility of the combined HERA data with the Standard Model. So the size of statistical fluctuation is comparable!

2.2 Compositeness

Adler (hep-ph/9702378) is the first 1997 theory of the HERA effect. In his "frustrated $\text{SU}(4)$ " for preons, the positron interacts with a gluon and makes a transition to a E^+ state, a kind of leptogluon which decays into a e^+ and a jet.

Akama, Katsuura and Terazawa (hep-ph/9704327) revive a 1977 model and calculate cross-sections for several different composite states. The conclusion is that certain composites are possible:

- leptoquark, e^{+*}

while excluded are:

- Z^*, q^* (by pre-existing mass bounds)

2.3 Contact Interactions

A general approach is due to Buchmuller and Wyler (hep-ph/9704317) who parametrize physics beyond the SM by four-fermion contact interactions; quark-lepton universality, absence of FCNC color-independence, flavor-independence and consistency with atomic parity violation results are imposed. There is then a unique current-current form of contact interaction:

$$\frac{\epsilon}{\Lambda^2} J^\mu J_\mu \quad (1)$$

where:

$$J^\mu = \bar{u}\gamma^5\gamma^\mu u + \bar{d}\gamma^5\gamma^\mu d + \bar{e}\gamma^5\gamma^\mu e + \bar{\nu}\gamma^5\gamma^\mu \nu \quad (2)$$

This contact term shares the U(45) invariance of the standard model when the gauge and Yukawa couplings vanish.

Rare processes like $K_L \rightarrow e^- \mu^+$ and LEP2 data constrain $\Lambda > 5\text{TeV}$. The HERA data require, on the other hand, $\Lambda < 3\text{TeV}$. So Buchmuller and Wyler conclude that *if* there is new physics there must be sizeable breaking of quark-lepton symmetry and/or new particles.

Nelson(hep-ph/9703379) looks at the atomic parity violation constraints.

Di Bartolomeno and Fabbrichesi(hep-ph/9703375) and Barger, Cheung, Hagiwara and Zeppenfeld (hep-ph/9703311) concur that $\Lambda < 3\text{TeV}$ is needed to fit the HERA data.

Gonzales-Garcia and Novaes (hep-ph/9703346) examine constraints on contact interactions from the one-loop contribution to $Z \rightarrow e^+e^-$.

2.4 Leptoquark [R Breaking Squark]

As mentioned above, 22 of the 30 papers in 1997 are in this direction. From here on we assume a direct-channel resonance in e^+q .

Note that a *valence* quark is more likely than a *sea* antiquark because the latter is going to give e^-p effects conflicting with the data, despite the twenty times smaller integrated luminosity.

Also: a scalar is more likely than a vector. A vector leptoquark has a coupling $\phi_\mu^\dagger G^{\mu\nu} \phi_\nu$ to gluons and would be produced by $\bar{q}q \rightarrow g \rightarrow \phi^\dagger \phi$ at the Tevatron. We expect therefore the leptoquark to be a scalar corresponding to $(e^+u)^{5/3}$ and/or $(e^+d)^{2/3}$.

There are seven scalar leptoquark couplings to $e^\pm q$, three of which involve e^+q . All demand that the LQ is an SU(2) doublet:

$$\mathcal{O} = \lambda_{ij} \mathcal{L}_j \oplus \mathcal{L}_i^c \quad (3)$$

$$\mathcal{O}' = \lambda'_{ij} \mathcal{L}_j \oplus \mathcal{L}_i^c \quad (4)$$

$$\mathcal{O}'' = \lambda''_{ij} \mathcal{Q}_j \mathcal{L}_i^c \quad (5)$$

For $\mathcal{O}$ to explain HERA data, $\lambda_{11} \sim 0.05$.

The branching ratio $B(K_L \rightarrow e^+e^-\pi^0) \leq 4.3 \times 10^{-9}$ implies that $\lambda_{11}\lambda_{12} \leq 1.5 \times 10^{-4}$. This means $\lambda_{12} \leq 3 \times 10^{-3}$, an unusual flavor hierarchy.

The rare decays $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$ and $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ also constrain the off-diagonal λ_{ij} .

The conclusion about the flavor couplings of the leptoquark is:

- The leptoquark scalar needs to couple nearly diagonally to mass-eigenstate quarks.

If one believes in weak-scale SUSY, a special case of scalar leptoquark is an R-symmetry breaking squark. The quantity $R = (-1)^{3B+L+2S}$ clearly must be broken because e^+q has $R = +1$ and $\tilde{q}$ has $R = -1$.

In the superpotential $\lambda_{ijk} L_i L_j \bar{E}_k + \lambda'_{ijk} L_i Q_k D_k + \lambda''_{ijk} U_i D_j D_k$, we put $\lambda''_{ijk} = 0$ for B conservation. Then to explain the data we need $\lambda'_{1j1} \sim 0.04/\sqrt{B}$ where $B(\tilde{q} \rightarrow e^+d)$ is the branching ratio.

Neutrinoless double beta decay $(\beta\beta)_{0\nu}$ requires $\lambda'_{111} < 7 \times 10^{-3}$ which excludes $\tilde{q} = \tilde{u}$.

Can the squark be $\tilde{q} = \tilde{c}$? If so, it implies that the rare decay, $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \nu \bar{\nu}$, being measured at Brookhaven is close to its current bound, which is interesting.

Finally, if $\tilde{q} = \tilde{t}$, atomic parity violation implies that $|\lambda'_{131}| < 0.5$, so the branching ratio B can be much less than 1 and still be consistent.

3. The SU(15) Possibility

The paper[33], published in 1992, *predicts* light leptoquarks in e^-p , the mode in which HERA was then running.

Such scalar leptoquarks predicted by SU(15) lie at the *weak* scale. The situation can be contrasted with SU(5) grand unification where "leptoquark" gauge bosons couple to $\bar{\mathbf{5}}$ and $\mathbf{10}$, are simultaneously "biquarks", and hence must have mass $\sim 10^{16}\text{GeV}$.

At the Warsaw Rochester Conference in July 1996, the speakers from HERA and Tevatron report failure to find leptoquarks so I thought my idea might be wrong.

Now it is worth spending a few minutes to review SU(15).

The SU(15) GUT was inspired by the desire to *remove proton decay*. With:

$$15 = (u_1, u_2, u_3, d_1, d_2, d_3, \bar{u}_1, \bar{u}_2, \bar{u}_3, \bar{d}_1, \bar{d}_2, \bar{d}_3, e^+, \nu, e^-) \quad (6)$$

three times, every gauge boson has definite B and L which are therefore conserved in the gauge sector.

The symmetry breaking may be assumed to follow the steps:

$$SU(15) \xrightarrow{M_{GUT}} SU(12)_q \times SU(3)_l \quad (7)$$

$$\xrightarrow{M_B} SU(6)_L \times SU(6)_R \times U(1) \quad (8)$$

$$\xrightarrow{M_A} SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1) \quad (9)$$

M_{GUT} can be as low as $6 \times 10^6 \text{ GeV}$, for $M_A = M_W$. Once we select M_A , the other two scales M_B and M_{GUT} are calculable from the renormalization group equations.

In SU(15), the family-diagonal scalar leptoquark is in the **120** representation. The content of **120** is shown in [33]. It contains $(3, 2)_{Y=7/6}$ under $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$. This SU(2) doublet has the quantum numbers of $(e^+ u)$ and $(e^+ d)$, required to explain the HERA data.

The point is that this irreducible representation contains the standard Higgs doublet so there is every reason to expect the scalar leptoquarks to lie near the weak scale $\sim 250 \text{ GeV}$. SU(15) predicts further leptoquark and "bifermion" states at or near the weak scale.

The discovery of light leptoquarks would be evidence as compelling as proton decay for grand unification.

4. Summary

The HERA data (H1 and ZEUS Collaborations) suggest an s-channel scalar resonance at $\sim 200 \text{ GeV}$ in $e^+ q$.

There are 30 papers to explain 14 events.

The consistency of the H1 and ZEUS data has been questioned.

Possible explanations from 1997 include:

- Compositeness
- Contact interactions.
- Leptoquark (R breaking squark).

In 1992:

- An SU(15) GUT predicted light scalar leptoquarks.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported in part by the US Department of Energy under Grant No. DE-FG02-97ER41036.

References

- [1] H1 COLLABORATION: Z. Phys. **C74**, 191 (1997).
- [2] ZEUS COLLABORATION, Z. Phys. **C74**, 207 (1997).
- [3] S.L. Adler, hep-ph/9702378.
- [4] D. Choudhury and S. Raychaudhuri, hep-ph/9702392.
- [5] T.K. Kuo and T. Lee, hep-ph/9703255.
- [6] G. Altarelli, J. Ellis, S. Lola, G.F. Giudice and M.L. Mangano, hep-ph/9703276.
- [7] H. Dreiner and P. Morawitz, hep-ph/9703279.
- [8] R. Fiore, L.L. Jenkovsky, F. Paccanoni and E. Predazzi, hep-ph/9703283.
- [9] M.A. Doncheski and S. Godfrey, hep-ph/9703285.
- [10] J. Bluemlein, hep-ph/9703287.
- [11] J. Kalinowski, R. Rueckl, H. Spiesberger and P.M. Zerwas, hep-ph/9703288.
- [12] K.S. Babu, C. Kolda, J. March-Russell and F. Wilczek, hep-ph/9703299.
- [13] V. Barger, K. Cheung, K. Hagiwara and D. Zeppenfeld, hep-ph/9703331.
- [14] M. Suzuki, hep-ph/9703316.
- [15] M. Drees, hep-ph/9703332.
- [16] J.L. Hewett and T. Rizzo, hep-ph/9703337.
- [17] G.K. Leontaris and J.D. Vergados, hep-ph/9703338.
- [18] M.C. Gonzalez-Garcia and S.F. Novaes, hep-ph/9703346.
- [19] D. Choudhury and R. Raychaudhuri, hep-ph/9703369.
- [20] C.G. Papadopoulos, hep-ph/9703372.
- [21] N. Di Bartolomeo and M. Fabbrichesi, hep-ph/9703375.
- [22] A.E. Nelson, hep-ph/9703379.
- [23] Z. Kunszt and W.J. Stirling, hep-ph/9703427.
- [24] T. Plehn, H. Spiesberger, M. Spira and P.M. Zerwas, hep-ph/9703436.
- [25] J. Kalinowski, R. Rueckl, H. Spiesberger and P.M. Zerwas, hep-ph/9703436.
- [26] H. Dreiner, E. Perez and Y. Sirois, hep-ph/9703444.

- [27] C. Friberg, E. Norrbin and T. Sjostrand, hep-ph/9704214.
- [28] T. Kon and T. Kobayashi, hep-ph/9704221.
- [29] R. Barbieri, Z. Berezhiani and A. Strumia, hep-ph/9704275.
- [30] I. Montvay, hep-ph/9704280.
- [31] W. Buchmuller and D. Wyler, hep-ph/9704317.
- [32] K. Akama, K. Katsuura and H. Terazawa, hep-ph/9704327.
- [33] P.H. Frampton, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A7**, 559 (1992).